REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated September 26, 2007, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,907,112 ("*Guedalia*"). Based on the arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I.   § 102 REJECTIONS

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the…claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

With respect to claim 1, *Guedalia* fails to teach "the email application summarizes email messages." The Examiner cited *Guedalia* at col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 49 as teaching this limitation. See Office Action dated 09/26/07, page 2, item 3. However, the citations from *Guedalia* only mention compressed audio files and parsing emails for text-to-speech tasks. A compressed audio file is not a summary of an email as required in claim 1. Further, parsing emails as described in *Guedalia* refers to extracting email text for text-to-speech tasks as granular units (*e.g.*, sentences) to avoid blocking (when a large processing task blocks a small processing task) and is unrelated to summarizing an email as required in claim 1 (see col. 31, lines 38-58). As an example, Applicants' email application may summarize the content of an email into a word, sentence or paragraph. *Guedalia* does not teach any such email summarization. Because *Guedalia* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 1, *Guedalia* cannot anticipate claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Guedalia*.

With respect to claims 11 and 19, *Guedalia* fails to teach "selecting a mode for sequencing through a plurality of emails according to a voice command." The Examiner cited Fig. 1A and col. 22, lines 8-59 of *Guedalia* as teaching this

limitation. See Office Action dated 09/26/07, page 4, last paragraph and page 6, second full paragraph. However, the citations from *Guedalia* only mention options for viewing and sharing WAV or REALAUDIO files that are unrelated to <u>selecting a mode for sequencing through a plurality of email</u> as required in claims 11 and 19. Examples of Applicants' email sequencing modes include an entire email mode, an email summary mode, an email subject mode, an email sender mode, and an important emails mode. *Guedalia* does not teach any such email sequencing modes. Because *Guedalia* fails to teach at least one limitation of claims 11 and 19, *Guedalia* cannot anticipate claims 11 and 19. For at least this reason, claims 11 and 19 and their dependent claims are allowable over *Guedalia*.

With regard to claim 26, *Guedalia* fails to teach "means for changing an email sequencing mode according to a voice command of the user." The Examiner states claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 (see Office Action dated 09/26/07, page 8, first full paragraph) even though the limitations of claims 1 and 26 are different. As previously mentioned, *Guedalia* describes options for viewing and sharing WAV or REALAUDIO files that are unrelated to changing an email sequencing mode. Applicants' email sequencing modes allows a user to access entire emails, email summaries, email senders, email subjects, and important emails. *Guedalia* does not teach changing any such email sequencing modes. Because *Guedalia* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 26, *Guedalia* cannot anticipate claim 26. For at least this reason, claim 26 and its dependent claims are allowable over *Guedalia*.

II.   CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may

be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

_____/Alan D. Christenson/_____
Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400